

Appl. No. 09/909,486
Amdt. Dated July 26, 2004
Reply to Office Action of May 27, 2004

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 11-20 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-10 stand rejected.

Claim 1 has been amended to insert "exhibiting" in place of the phrase "being capable of." Basis for this amendment may be found on page 7, lines 23-34 of the specification.

Claim 7 has been amended to insert "exhibiting" in place of the phrase "capable of." Basis for this amendment may be found on page 7, lines 23-34 of the specification.

Applicants submit that these amendments are appropriate under 37 C.F.R. §1.116(b) in that Claims 1 and 7 are in better form for consideration on appeal. In the Office Action dated May 27, 2004, the Office stated that "recitation that an element is 'capable of' performing a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform." Applicants assert that the amendment removes the issue from appeal by making 70% extension in the cross machine direction at a loading of 10 g/cm a positive limitation.

As such, entry of these amendments is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

For: F.N. Desai, et al.

By 

Eric T. Addington
Registration No. 52,403
Tele. No. (513) 626-1602

Date: July 26, 2004
Customer No. 27752